£.	1	Case 5:08-cv-03608-RS Document 1	Filed 07/28/2008 Page 1 of 9
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Robert C. Weems (CA SBN 148156) WEEMS LAW OFFICES Fair-Anselm Plaza, 2d Fl. W 751 Center Blvd. Fairfax, CA 94930 Telephone: (415) 259-0294 Facsimile: (415) 259-0108 Attorneys for Plaintiff MOTOR WORKS, LLC	FILED 08 JUL 28 PM 4: 08 RICHARD W. WIEKING 155 RICHARD W. WIEKING 155 RICHARD W. WIEKING 155 RICHARD W. WIEKING 155
u	9 10 11		ES DISTRICT COURT RICT OF CALIFORNIA
	12 13		adirco Divional 3608
	14	MOTOR WORKS LLC,) Case No:
	15	Plaintiffs,	
	16	v.	COMPLAINT
	17 18 19	SAFER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., CERMA TECHNOLOGY, INC., GEORGE ACKERMAN, MARY STRANAHAN, NICHOLAS STREIT, TIM STREIT and EDWARD HALBACH	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
	20	Defendants.	_)
	21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	SAFER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., CERMA T MARY STRANAHAN, TIM STREIT, NICH alleges as follows: JURISDICTI	ON AND VENUE rt under 15 USC §1051-1127 (hereinafter the
		COMPLAINT	1 Motor Works LLC v. Safer, Inc.

Document 1

Filed 07/28/2008

Page 2 of 9

27

28

Case 5:08-cv-03608-RS

COMMON ALLEGATIONS

Filed 07/28/2008

- 7. Plaintiff is a leading developer, manufacturer and distributor of certain ceramic lubrication oil additives. Due to the nature of its business, plaintiff's intellectual property is one of its most valuable assets.
- 8. Plaintiff has been continuously involved in developing, manufacturing and distributing ceramic lubrication oil additives since its inception. Since early 2006 it has marketed oil additives under the trademark CERMA including the marks CERMA, CERMA LUBRICATION, CERMAX, CERMA ENGINE LUBE, CERMA LUBE, CERMA ADVANCED LUBRICATION TECHNOLOGY, CERMA ORGANIC establishing a family of CERMA marks. Plaintiff has advertised, marketed and distributed its products under its CERMA family of marks throughout the United States and internationally. Plaintiff's trademark has become, through widespread and favorable industry acceptance and recognition, an asset of substantial value as a symbol of Plaintiff, its quality products and its good will.
- 9. Plaintiff has devoted substantial time, effort and resources to the development and promotion throughout the United States of the CERMA family of marks and of the goods sold under said marks both domestically and internationally. Plaintiff has also expanded its use of CERMA into a family of marks associated with its products including motor coatings. As a result of these promotional efforts, the purchasing public has come to know, rely upon, and recognize the business and services of Plaintiff by such name and mark. By virtue of Plaintiff's marketing efforts and expenditures, and as a result of the excellence of its products, Plaintiff's marks have achieved a valuable reputation and a high degree of goodwill.
- 10. Plaintiff has recently learned that Defendants are using confusingly similar marks and marks owned by Plaintiff for oil additives. Defendant has also filed federal trademark applications for certain marks, including: CERMAX and CERMA ADVANCED LUBRICATION TECHNOLOGY.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at least Defendant CERMA TECHNOLOGY, INC. and SAFER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. manufacture or have manufactured and sell oil additives improperly reverse engineered in violation of a

distribution agreement between MOTOR WORKS, LLC and CERMA TECHNOLOGY, INC..

Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at least these Defendants are a direct competitor of Plaintiff in this respect. That the respective products are directly competitive is evinced by a page from Defendant CERMA TECHNOLOGY, INC.'s website which uses Plaintiff's promotional and research materials as if Defendants' own.

- ADVANCED LUBRICATION TECHNOLOGY in interstate commerce for oil additives, despite Plaintiff's established common law rights in, and imminent registration for, trademarks within the CERMA family of marks. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant adopted its marks with full knowledge of Plaintiff's products and trademarks and with the intention that consumers would be confused into believing that Defendants' products were sponsored, associated or affiliated in some way with Plaintiff and its products.
- products. Any failure, neglect or default by Defendant in providing such products will reflect adversely on Plaintiff as the believed source of origin thereof, hampering efforts by Plaintiff to continue to protect its reputation for high quality products. This will cause Plaintiff, *inter alia*, to lose sales and the benefit of its considerable expenditures to promote its products under its CERMA family of marks, all to Plaintiff's detriment.
- 14. Because Plaintiff's and Defendants' products are directly competitive, it is natural for consumers to assume that said products and their sources are associated or affiliated. Such a result significantly undermines Plaintiff's substantial efforts to establish its identity in this field. Plaintiff has requested that Defendant cease and desist from infringing Plaintiff's trademark, but Defendant has refused to comply with said requests. Despite Plaintiff's requests, Defendant, with actual notice of the infringement, willfully and blatantly continues to advertise and market its products under the CERMAX and CERMA ADVANCED LUBRICATION TECHNOLOGY marks. Said acts of infringement will cause further irreparable injury to Plaintiff if Defendant is not restrained by this Court from further violation of Plaintiff's rights, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

2

3

4 5

6

8

7

9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

COUNT I

(FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN)

- Plaintiff incorporates herein all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 15. 1 through 14 of this Complaint.
- Plaintiff's CERMA family of trademarks have become uniquely 16. associated with, and hence identifies, Plaintiff. Defendants' interstate use of the designation CERMAX and CERMA ADVANCED LUBRICATION TECHNOLOGY marks is a false designation of origin, or a false representation, that wrongfully and falsely designates Defendants' products as originating from, or being connected with, Plaintiff and constitutes the use of false descriptions or representations in interstate commerce. Defendants' use is likely to deceive consumers into believing that Defendants' products are those of or associated with Plaintiff, and as a consequence, Defendants' use is likely to divert, and has diverted, consumers away from Plaintiff's products.
- Defendants' actions described above and specifically, without limitation, 17. Defendants' use of the CERMAX and CERMA ADVANCED LUBRICATION TECHNOLOGY marks to promote its goods to the same audience as that for Plaintiff's goods constitutes a false designation of origin and unfair competition in violation of the Lanham Act.
- Defendants' adoption and use of a mark so similar to Plainitff's CERMA 18. family of marks has caused, and continues to cause, irreparable injury to the value and goodwill of Plaintiff's mark, as well as to Plaintiff's business, goodwill and reputation. Defendants' actions, if not enjoined, will continue, including the sale of its services through the same channels of trade used by Plaintiff and to the same customers targeted by Plaintiff. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law in that the amount of its damages is difficult to ascertain with certainty.
- As a result of Defendants' false designation of origin and unfair 19. competition, Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur damages in an amount to be proven at trial consisting of, among other things, actual diversion of trade and diminution in the value of the goodwill associated with its trademark.

20. Defendants' actions as described above are deliberate, willful, fraudulent and without any extenuating circumstances, and constitute a knowing violation of Plaintiff's rights. Upon registration of one or more of its CERMA family of marks, Plaintiff is entitled to recover three times the amount of its actual damages and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action, as this is an "exceptional" case under Section 35 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §1117.

Page 6 of 9

COUNT II

(COMMON LAW UNFAIR COMPETITION)

- 21. Plaintiff incorporates herein all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 20 of this Complaint.
- 22. By virtue of Defendants' acts as pleaded above, Defendant has engaged in unfair competition with Plaintiff.

COUNT III

(CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW)

- 23. Plaintiff incorporates herein all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs1 through 22 of this Complaint.
- 24. By virtue of Defendants' acts as pleaded above, Defendant has engaged in unfair competition in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§17200, et seq.
- and continue to cause irreparable injury to the value and goodwill of Plaintiff's CERMA family of marks, as well as to Plaintiff's business, goodwill and reputation. Defendants' actions, if not enjoined, will continue through the same channels of trade used by Plaintiff and to the same customers targeted by Plaintiff. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law in that the amount of its damages is difficult to ascertain with certainty.
- 26. As a result of Defendants' acts of unfair competition and false advertising, Plaintiff has incurred damages in an amount to be proven at trial consisting of, among other things, actual diversion of its trade and diminution in the value of goodwill associated with Plaintiff and the CERMA family of marks.

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

2021

22

2324

25

27

26

28

COUNT IV

(CALIFORNIA ANTI-DILUTION VIOLATION)

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates herein all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 26 of this Complaint.
- 28. Defendants' acts, as pleaded above, have caused injury and there exists a further likelihood of injury, to Plaintiff's business reputation and of dilution of the distinctive quality of Plaintiff's CERMA family of marks and forms of advertisement of same, within California Business and Professions Code §14330.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands:

- 1. That Defendant, its officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys and all those persons in active concert or participation with them be forthwith preliminarily and thereafter permanently enjoined and restrained from:
 - a. Using any of the CERMA family of trademarks or any confusingly similar designation alone or in combination with other words, as a trademark, trade name component or otherwise, to market, advertise or identify Defendants' products.
 - b. Otherwise infringing Plaintiff's marks;
 - c. Unfairly competing with Plaintiff in any manner whatsoever; and
 - d. Causing likelihood of confusion, injury to business reputation, or dilution of the distinctiveness of Plaintiff's symbols, labels, or forms of advertisement.
- 2. That Defendant be directed to file with this Court and serve on Plaintiff within ten days after the service of the injunction herein, a report in writing under oath, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which defendant has complied therewith;
- That Defendant be required to deliver up and destroy all devices,
 literature, advertising and other material bearing the infringing designation;
- 4. That Plaintiff be awarded Defendants' trademark infringement profits after an accounting, and that such an award be trebled, pursuant to 15 USC §1117(a);
 - 5. That Plaintiff be awarded past and future corrective advertising costs;

	Case 5:08-cv-03608-RS	
1	6. That Plaintiff be awarded exemplary and punitive damages in an amou	ant
2	to be proven at trial.	
3	7. That Plaintiff recover from Defendant its reasonable attorneys' fees ar	ıd
4	costs in this suit, and that such an award be trebled, pursuant to 15 USC §1117(a); and	
5	8. That Plaintiff has such other and further monetary or other relief as the	Э
6	Court may deem just.	
7	July 28, 2008 WEEMS LAW OFFICES	
8		
9		
10	Robert C. Weems, attorneys for Plain	ıtiff
11	Motor Works LLC	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

	Case 5:08-cv-03608-RS Document 1 Filed 07/28/2008 Page 9 of 9
1	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
2	Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable.
3	y y wy se ma issued so arabic,
4	July 28, 2008 WEEMS LAW OFFICES
5	
6	
7	Robert C. Weems, attorneys for Plaintiff
8	Motor Works LLC
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
-	COMPLAINT

(Rev. 12/07) (cand Gasacos): 08-CV-03608-RS CI 文 LU (100 V 住席 SHF 1912 10 7/28/2008 Page 1 of 1 The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, a proved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.) PLAINTIFFS **DEFENDANTS** MOTOR WORKS, LLC SAFER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., CERMA TECHNOLOGY, INC., GEROGE ACKERMAN, MARY STRANAHAN, TIM STREIT, NICHOLAS STREIT, EDWARD HALBACH (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) Robert C. Weems, SBN 148156 (415) 259-0293 main WEEMS LAW OFFICES (415) 259-0108 fax Fair-Anselm Plaza, W. 2d Fl. 08 3608 751 Center Blvd. Fairfax, CA 94930 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF PTF DEF U.S. Government ★ 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State ____ i Incorporated or Principal Place \Box 4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business In This State U.S. Government **1** 2 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) of Business In Another State Citizen or Subject of a 3 Foreign Nation \square 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT FORFEITURE/PENALTY **TORTS** BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY ☐610 Agriculture ☐422 Appeal 28 USC 158 3400 State Reapportionment 120 Marine 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury 620 Other Food & Drug 1423 Withdrawal 410 Antitrust 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice 625 Drug Related Seizure 28 USC 157 430 Banks and Banking 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 88 450 Commerce 150 Recovery of Overpayment 320 Assault, Libel & ☐630 Liquor Laws Product Liability 460 Deportation PROPERTY RIGHTS & Enforcement of Judgment Slander 640 R.R. & Truck 368 Asbestos Personal 470 Racketeer Influenced and 820 Copy lights 151 Medicare Act 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product 650 Airline Regs. Corrupt Organizations 152 Recovery of Defaulted 1830 Pater Liability 7660 Occupational Liability 3480 Consumer Credit ■ 840 Trademark Student Loans 340 Marine Safety/Health PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV (Excl. Veterans) 345 Marine Product **1**690 Other 1370 Other Fraud 310 Selective Service 153 Recovery of Overpayment Liability 350 Securities/Commodities/ 371 Truth in Lending of Veteran's Benefits LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY 350 Motor Vehicle Exchange 380 Other Personal 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle 🗖 710 Fair Labor Standard 861 HIA (1395ff) 3875 Customer Challenge Property Damage 190 Other Contract Product Liability 362 Black Lung (923) 12 USC 3410 385 Property Damage 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 720 Labor/Mgmt, Relations 3863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 890 Other Statutory Actions Product Liability 196 Franchise 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting 864 SSID Title XVI 891 Agricultural Acts PRISONER & Disclosure Act REAL PROPERTY 7865 RSI (405(g)) 892 Economic Stabilization Act CIVIL RIGHTS PETITIONS 740 Railway Labor Act 393 Environmental Matters 210 Land Condemnation 790 Other Labor Litigation 1441 Voting ■894 Energy Allocation Act 7510 Motions to Vacate 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 220 Foreclosure 442 Employment 895 Freedom of Information Sentence FEDERAL TAX SUITS 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment Security Act 7443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: Act 240 Torts to Land 900 Appeal of Fee Accommodations 530 General 370 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 245 Tort Product Liability 144 Welfare Determination 535 Death Penalty or Defendant) 290 All Other Real Property 1445 Amer. w/Disabilities Under Equal Access 540 Mandamus & Other IRS-Third Party **IMMIGRATION** 26 USC 7609 to Justice **Employment** 550 Civil Rights 462 Naturalization Application 1950 Constitutionality of 46 Amer, w/Disabilities 555 Prison Condition 463 Habeas Corpus -State Statutes Other Alien Detainee 7440 Other Civil Rights 165 Other Immigration Actions V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Transferred from Appeal to District □ I Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 another district 6 Multidistrict 7 Judge from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened (specify) Litigation Magistrate Judgment Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 USC 1117 VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause:

trademark infringement and unfair competition

VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

PLEASE REFER TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 CONCERNING REQUIREMENT TO FILE

DEMAND \$

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) "NOTICE OF RELATED CASE". IF ANY

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2) (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

July 24, 2008

N FRANCISCO/OAKLAND ŞIGNATURE OF TORNEY OF RECORD

SAN JOSE

JURY DEMAND:

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

☐ Yes☐ No